

Page 2 IN RE: Doc #56300 Motion for Approval of Settlement Agreement Among Citibank, N.A., and Certain of Its Affiliates, and Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., and Certain of Its Affiliates Transcribed by: Dawn South

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	QUINN EMANUEL
3	Attorneys for the Official Creditors' Committee
4	51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
5	New York, NY 10010
6	
7	BY: ANDREW J. ROSSMAN, ESQ.
8	CALLI RAY, ESQ.
9	
10	PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARROSIN LLP
11	Attorneys for the Defendants
12	1285 Avenue of the Americas
13	New York, NY 10019-6064
14	
15	BY: JAY COHEN, ESQ.
16	KYLE J. KIMPLER, ESQ.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Pg 4 01 27
	Page 4
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE COURT: Good morning.
3	MR. ROSSMAN: Good morning.
4	THE COURT: Please have a seat. Hello. How are
5	you today? It's good to see you.
6	MR. ROSSMAN: You too, Your Honor.
7	MR. COHEN: Good morning.
8	THE COURT: What should we do today?
9	(Laughter)
10	MR. ROSSMAN: We'd like to call no.
11	(Laughter)
12	MR. ROSSMAN: Your Honor, it's my privilege and my
13	pleasure to present a motion for settlement
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MR. ROSSMAN: under Bankruptcy Rule 9019 in the
16	Lehman against Citibank, a series of litigations. May I
17	begin?
18	THE COURT: Sure.
19	MR. ROSSMAN: So Andrew Rossman with Quinn Emanuel
20	for the official creditors' committee of Lehman Brothers
21	Holdings Inc., for the record. I see the podium is still
22	sideways, so I'll
23	THE COURT: The podium is still sideways because
24	we have another group coming in for a trial, so we just
25	thought we would adopt Mr. Cohen's excellent

	Fy 5 01 21
	Page 5
1	MR. ROSSMAN: You'd adopt Mr. Cohen's
2	THE COURT: excellent configuration. Although,
3	Mr. Cohen, you're not sitting in your usual chair today I
4	would note.
5	MR. COHEN: I've been reduced to a regular chair,
6	right.
7	THE COURT: Yes, you've been reduced to a regular
8	chair. But you may have noticed also that this is a
9	particularly rare case, because after you all left I
10	actually had to have the courtroom painted.
11	MR. ROSSMAN: We noticed.
12	THE COURT: Did you notice?
13	MR. ROSSMAN: We did notice, yeah.
14	THE COURT: It's quite lovely.
15	MR. ROSSMAN: The courtroom looks spiffy.
16	THE COURT: It does look spiffy, and larger.
17	MR. ROSSMAN: Yeah.
18	THE COURT: But we digress. Go ahead,
19	Mr. Rossman.
20	MR. ROSSMAN: We do.
21	So, Your Honor, I'm here today with my colleague,
22	Callie Ray, (indiscernible) Steve Mullaney and Kimberly
23	Cloud (ph) from the estate, smaller crowd than you're used
24	to seeing, but I assure you everyone is aware of what's
25	happening today and pleased that we got here.

08-13555-mg Doc 58049 Filed 04/25/18 Entered 05/08/18 11:23:56 Main Document Pg 6 of 27 Page 6 THE COURT: All right. Well I have read the 1 2 papers, so I'm happy to hear your presentation. 3 MR. ROSSMAN: Sure, I've got a very brief one. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 MR. ROSSMAN: But I think there are a few things 6 that merit saying. 7 THE COURT: Sure. 8 MR. ROSSMAN: First for the benefit of, you know, 9 posterity I do want to thank the Court, the court personnel, 10 court security officers, all of whom have protected us and 11 kept us comfortable here. 12 I want to especially recognize Your Honor's 13 chambers and dedicated clerks who have poured through all of 14 the pain and suffering we've bestowed upon you, and Ms. Isen in particular, and I want to -- who has probably 15 16 suffered the most -- and I do think it's important to 17 recognize the special role that the Court has played into this before I get into the merits of the settlement. 18 I think history thinks of the Honorable James Peck 19 20 as the Lehman judge, I think those who are in this courtroom

think of Your Honor, and the level of dedication, and you know, frankly skill and determination that the Court has brought to these proceedings in bringing them to the part of trial and guiding us through 42 days of some of the most complex trial material anyone will ever see and then

21

22

23

24

ultimately guiding us and aiding us to reach a settlement here, really is a testament to I think the extraordinary talents, and you know, frankly level of commitment that the Court has to these cases and to the cause of justice in this courthouse.

So we owe you an enormous debt and I didn't want that to go unsaid before I get to the substance of the case.

THE COURT: I appreciate your comments, I won't dispute your statements. I will agree with respect to commitment, that I will cop to that charge, but I won't -- I appreciate your other comments, so.

MR. ROSSMAN: So what we have here before you,
Your Honor, is a global settlement of all disputes between
the Lehman estate, the creditors' committee, and Citibank
and its affiliates, and it is, as Your Honor is well
familiar with the standards under Rule 9019 and TMT Trailer
Ferry, it is an appropriate approach to settle our massive
disputes to do it on a global basis taking into
consideration the difficulties of settling disputes
individually, something that we have taken into
consideration, and we have determined that the settlement
that you have before you easily exceeds the lowest end of
the range of reasonableness.

We come to you with a high degree of conviction that this is a settlement that is fair and reasonable in all

respects and appropriate for the estate and its creditors.

Just to briefly describe what we've got here.

It is not -- it is a settlement of what we the Citibank litigation, which is the adversary proceeding that includes the derivative claim objection and the dispute over the handling of the \$2 billion deposit that Lehman placed with Citibank in June of 2008. That adversary proceeding alone has a panoply of issues associated with it, some of which were the subject of summary judgment motions that were pending before Your Honor, and the subject of the trial that proceeded for some four months in this courthouse was over the close out of some 30,000 derivative trades and the claim that Citi and its affiliates asserted against Lehman Brothers Special Finance and its affiliates in the amount of -- in excess of \$2 billion.

It resolves the claim. It resolves all of the claims that have been asserted by Citibank against Lehman. It resolves that adversary proceeding. It disposes of the \$2 billion plus that are in that account. And it resolves other litigation as well. It resolves what we refer to as the CitiMortgage litigation, which is an effort -- was an effort to avoid an alleged preferential payment. It also resolves a series of litigations that we refer to as the flip clause litigations that relate to a modification in the change of the priority of payments that are made under

Page 9 certain swaps as a result of the bankruptcy event of 1 2 default. Your Honor has ruled on those cases that are on 3 appeal. It resolves that appeal as it relates to Citibank. So we will be upon, if the Court is so kind as to 4 approval this settlement when it becomes final, we will be 5 6 dismissing the relevant adversary proceedings and the claims 7 that are made against LBHI are going to be withdraw pursuant 8 to the settlement agreement. 9 They are a series of claims that are set forth 10 specifically in the settlement agreement that will be 11 assigned to LBHI. Those are claims against other Lehman affiliates, and those will be up to the plan administrator, 12 13 consistent with a plan, to determine the resolution of those 14 claims. We filed a supplement to the 9019 motion that 15 16 identifies specifically one of those claims that exceeds the 17 \$200 million threshold, so you'll see --18 THE COURT: Right. MR. ROSSMAN: -- in the supplement how that claim 19 20 is specifically --21 THE COURT: Yes. 22 MR. ROSSMAN: -- going to be treated. And in addition to the dismissal of prejudice of 23 24 the litigation, withdrawal from assignment of the claims 25 there's an exchange of mutual releases between the parties

Pg 10 of 27 Page 10 that are broad and relate to all of the disputed matters. 1 2 So it's all of the claims and defenses that were brought in the adversary proceedings or the disputed claim litigations 4 and any matters relating to or arising there from. So it is 5 what we think of as a global settlement or piecing the value 6 between the parties. 7 The substance of the settlement is very 8 straightforward. The litigation was complicated, the 9 settlement was actually relatively straightforward. 10 In the account that was -- originally held the 11 deposit of \$2 billion back in 2008, it's approximately 2.09 -- I'm sorry -- \$2.093 billion. 12 13 THE COURT: Uh-huh. MR. ROSSMAN: Citibank will debit to itself 14 \$350 million. 15 16 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 17 MR. ROSSMAN: The remainder of the content of that account and some other accounts will be transferred to 18 Lehman upon -- shortly after the effectiveness of the 19 20 settlement, no later than five business days --21 THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROSSMAN: -- from the effectiveness of this 22 23 settlement agreement, which will result in a return to the 24 estate of approximately \$1.74 billion, which the estate is

prepared to try to distribute it as rapidly as it can

consistent with its obligations under the plan and the confirmation order, to all of Lehman's creditors.

So in terms of the 9019 standards, which Your

Honor is -- and let me just pause there for a second to see

if Your Honor has any questions about --

THE COURT: Nope.

MR. ROSSMAN: -- the content of the settlement.

In terms of the standard under 9019 the -- I think Your Honor is well familiar with the probability of success and the uncertainties of the facts and the law regarding this case.

The complexity, expense, and duration of this
litigation is unlike any many people have seen in their
legal careers. It's as long a trial, perhaps as almost any
that's been held in the courthouse. The issues were
presented I would say, Your Honor, at a level of detail with
a level of -- and I'm referring to my adversaries for a
moment -- with a level of vigor and skill and
professionalism that I don't think is exceeded anywhere. So
I think you got a strong of presentation of a dispute issue
could have for resolution.

I'm aware of no creditors who are objecting to this settlement. You have the full support of the creditors' committee, as well as the support of the Lehman estate. Competence of counsel I hope you come to the

collusion that we know what we're doing by now.

THE COURT: I'll have more to say -- I'll have something to say about that towards the end of the hearing.

MR. ROSSMAN: Arms length bargaining. This is the -- not only was it litigated, but there was an extensive process of trying to resolve this over the course of many years culminating in a five-day mediation presided over by Your Honor. So I think it easily surpasses anyone's notion of arms length.

In terms of the debtor's informed judgment you have a debtor here who has seen more of these claims than anyone else, including claims involving the big banks that than could be imagined, so you know, the debtor, and you have in the record the declaration of Steven Mullaney, who has testified in this court who is, you know, the business owner of this particular case and the top valuation professional of the estate, one of the top business persons at the estate, you know, supporting the substance of the settlement, he's a person who knows well of what he speaks, and the entire estate supporting the settlement.

And finally in terms of the relative benefits obviously we have the concrete benefit of the return of substantial funds to the Lehman estate and the creditors.

So for all of those reasons we very much support the settlement, we're pleased to be here, and we thank

everyone for indulging us to get to that point.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. Does anyone else wish to be heard with respect to the request to approve the settlement of all claims between Lehman and Citibank as set forth in the motion papers that have been filed on behalf of the estate?

Okay. I'm going read a short decision into the record, and then when I conclude with that there are some other comments that I'd like to make to the parties and frankly for the record.

Before the Court is the motion of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. as plan administrator on behalf of itself, Lehman Brothers Special Financing, and the other Lehman entities, together with the official committee of unsecured creditors seeking the entry of an order pursuant to Rule 9019 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure and Section 105(a) of title 11 of the United States Code for approval of a settlement agreement dated as of September 29th, 2017 by and among the plan administrator on behalf of LBHI, LBSF, and the other Lehman entities, and Citibank, N.A. on behalf of itself and the other Citibank entities.

Prior to the petition date LBHI had deposited \$2 billion with Citibank, and prior to the date of the

settlement motion the Lehman entities maintained deposit accounts with Citibank with an aggregate balance of approximately \$2.093 billion.

The settlement agreement between the plan administrator and Citibank resolves the relevant claims, including the settled claims, and the relevant adversary proceedings, as such terms are defined in the motion, and will result in the return of approximately \$1.74 billion to the Lehman entities from the deposit accounts with Citibank.

Pursuant to the settlement agreement all of the pending litigation between the parties that is before this Court will be resolved, including the Citibank litigation, the CitiMortgage litigation, and the flip clause litigation, each of which the Court is intimately familiar with and which is described in greater deal in the motion.

Rule 9019 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy

Procedure provides in pertinent part that, "After notice and a hearing the Court may approve a compromise or settlement."

Courts have held that a settlement under

Bankruptcy Rule 9019 will be approved if it is fair and

equitable and in the best interest of the estate.

The settlement proponent bears the burden to persuade the Court that the settlement is in the best interest of the estate.

In assessing whether a settlement is in the best

interest of the estate "it is not necessary for the Court to conduct a mini-trial of the facts or the merits underlying each dispute." In re: Adelphia Communications Corp., 368

Bankruptcy 140, Bankruptcy Southern District of New York,

2007. Rather the Court must be apprised of those facts that are necessary to enable it to evaluate the settlement and to make a considered and independent judgment.

To be approved the settlement need not be the best that the debtor could have obtained, rather "there is a range of reasonableness with respect to a settlement. A range which recognizes the uncertainties of law and fact in any particular case and the common risks and costs necessarily inherent in taking any litigation to completion." Newman versus Stein, 464 F.2d 689, Second Circuit, 1972. Cert denied 409 U.S. 1039, 1972.

When courts in the Second Circuit consider whether a settlement is within the range of reasonableness they apply the following factors set forth in Motorola versus Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors. In re: Iridium Operating, LLC, 478 F.3d 452, Second Circuit, 2007, colloquially known as the Iridium factors.

One, the balance between the litigation's possibility of success and the settlement's future benefits.

Two, the likelihood of complex and protractive litigation with its intended expense, inconvenience, and

Page 16 1 delay. 2 Three, the paramount interest of creditors. 3 Four, whether other parties in interest support the settlement. 4 5 Five, the nature and breadth of releases to be 6 obtained by officers and directors. 7 Six, the competency and experience of counsel 8 supporting, and the experience and knowledge of the 9 bankruptcy judge reviewing the settlement. 10 And seven, the extent to which the settlement is 11 the product of arms length bargaining. 12 In evaluating the reasonableness of the settlement 13 agreement here the Court has applied the Iridium factors and 14 concludes that the settlement is well within the range of 15 reasonableness and is unquestionably in the best interest of 16 the Lehman estates. 17 In particular when considering two of the most 18 significant Iridium factors, one, whether the likelihood of the plan administrator succeeding in litigating the claims 19 20 proposed to be settled is outweighed by the future benefits 21 the estate can enjoy from the proposed settlement; and two, 22 the prospect of complex and protracted litigation were the settlement not to be approved, the Court finds that such 23 24 factors clearly and overwhelmingly weigh in favor of 25 approval of the settlement.

By the settled claims the Citibank entities have asserted approximately \$2.1 billion in claims against the Lehman entities, the majority of which have been asserted in full against LBSF, LBCC, or LBCS as primary obligor, and against LBHI as guarantor.

The settled claims involve more than 30,000 transactions, including complex derivatives transactions which were currently being litigated before the Court in the Citibank litigation which was pending at the time of to settlement.

In addition, as described in the motion and in the declaration of Mr. Mullaney filed in support thereof, the relevant adversary proceedings involve dozens of other causes of action based on equally complex prepetition financial transactions involving the Citibank entities and the Lehman entities.

As Mr. Mullaney describes, the plan administrator's attempts to settle these complex disputes on an individual or piecemeal basis proved to be difficult and impractical.

Although the plan administrator has asserted that many of the claims asserted by the Citibank estates are greatly overstated and could greatly be reduced if litigated to finality, the plan administrator also recognizes that litigation is inherently uncertain and thus determined in

the exercise of its sound business judgment that a global settlement of the relevant adversary proceedings and the benefits of such a settlement would outweigh the likelihood of success in litigating each of to disputes.

The Court concludes that the plan administrator's determination is reasonable and should be approved.

In examining a settlement pursuant to Bankruptcy
Rule 9019 the Court need not determine a specific dollar
amount for the claims at issue, rather the Court is required
to evaluate whether the settlement, as an integrated
compromise, falls above or below the lowest point in the
range of reasonableness.

The Court finds that given the numerous highly complex disputes being resolved through the settlement agreement and the Lehman estate's ability to immediately recover substantial funds from Citibank that have been held in the deposit accounts for nearly nine years, the determination to enter into the settlement falls well above the lowest point in the range of reasonableness.

Moreover, the Court finds that the prospect of complex and protracted litigation without a settlement, the second Iridium factor, is all but certain. This factor also weighs heavily in favor of approval of the settlement agreement.

The plan administrator has asserted that

litigation of the relevant adversary proceedings will continue to be time-consuming and expensive. The Citibank litigation alone, which the Court notes is only one of the relevant adversary proceedings being settled here, has involved 5 years of discovery, the production of over 1.4 million documents, over 30 expert witnesses, approximately 100 depositions -- 170 depositions, and span 42 days of trial thus far.

Entry into the settlement agreement enables the Lehman entities to avoid expending further resources in connection with all disputes with Citibank in the Lehman cases, including the Citibank litigation.

Accordingly, the Court finds that the plan administrator's determination to enter into the settlement agreement is a reasonable determination in view of the time and expense of complex litigation that will be avoided by the settlement and in light of the Lehman estate's ability to recover \$1.74 billion at this time.

The Court finds that the plan administrator appropriately exercised its business judgment here, and the Court approves the settlement pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019.

Okay. So that concludes my ruling, which you can reference in the order that you present approving the settlement.

But I'd like to take a few minutes, if you don't mind, to say some things.

This has been an extraordinary experience for all of us, for me personally, and for my staff. Ms. Chu started when the trial started. She was not even here for I think it was five days of argument on summary judgment motions, and that's not even counting the summary judgment motion that we held some time ago, which I think might even be before Mr. Cohen's involvement in the case. I think we had your partner, Mr. Shimshak here and your other partner, Ms. Hammerman, on that as well.

Given the scope and complexity of this the parties' level of cooperation during the run up to the trial is -- was and is remarkable. There were very few discovery disputes. There were very few, if any, disputes over scheduling. And I think that reflects, notwithstanding the difficulty and the huge stakes that were involved here, that counsel maintained an excellent working relationship with one another, and your respect for each other was on display and manifest during the entirety of this case. It was quite extraordinary. There were some very tense moments, and your respect and civility to one another and to the Court were unflagging and were noteworthy.

Next, the teams that you brought to bear.

Certainly, Mr. Rossman, and you Mr. Cohen, had the lead

role, the burden of which I can only imagine. I know that your work every day here didn't end when you left, and I truly cannot imagine the physical and emotional toll that it took. But you were backed up by tremendous teams, some of whom I got to see in action, and I am grateful for the fact that given how high the stakes were you had the confidence to, and the good sense frankly, to enable some of your junior partners and associates to present testimony before the Court. To a man and a woman they were fabulous, and I hope that for some of them, many of whom it may have been their first time presenting such a significant piece of evidence, it will not be the last time. I was grateful for that and it's very much appreciated and your mentorship of them I think was very much in evidence.

There were undoubtedly a lot of people that I didn't get to see who were hold up in those rooms that you had in the courthouse buried beneath jelly beans and printers and coffee cups, and to each and every one of them we are grateful.

Things went remarkably smoothly here. We had very few technical glitches. There were real-time demonstratives produced. All of it was quite remarkable and I think you too, Mr. Rossman and Mr. Cohen, would be the first to acknowledge that you couldn't have done it without the support of those teams. So for that I am grateful.

Your clients, many of whom sat here day in, day out paying rapt attention to everything that happened. Some were not able to be here every day, some had other business to attend to. I know that they were paying attention to everything that occurred.

During the course of the trial, which began in April and the leaves were coming on the trees and ends today when leaves are falling off the trees, people experienced life events. Not just birthdays and anniversaries, we had at least one birth --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think we had three.

THE COURT: We had three?

MS. RAY: Almost four.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MS. RAY: Four as of today.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Four today.

of one. One of the wonderful people from Citibank who was here faithfully day in and day out until her newborn child made it impossible for her to be here. so that's something. I think -- I don't think if we had Bat Mitzvahs and Bar Mitzvahs. We had beginnings of college. And there was some loss on both sides. I know that representatives of clients lost family members who were dear to them.

And notwithstanding that -- and this is quite

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

extraordinary -- notwithstanding that I know that they remained engaged in the process in which they had an amazing level of dedication.

People think of these cases as just about money, and I think that certainly they're about money, but they're also about peoples dedication to the people that they work with, peoples dedication to principles of law, and the way practices are conducted at various firms, and I think people were also aware of the significance beyond these four walls of what occurred here.

For better or worse the Court was not given the opportunity to pronounce any rules of law, but the case nonetheless I think was and will be very instructive, lots of issues having to do with the conduct of these cases and the nature of these derivatives.

It was certainly a learning process. I learned a lot. I've probably forgotten a little bit of it by now, but I certainly learned a lot and I hoped that everybody learned a lot too.

Finally, the level of skill, the level of good nature, the level of generosity of spirit that you,

Mr. Rossman, and you, Mr. Cohen, brought to bear I will never forget. I see a lot of very skilled lawyers in here, and that is my great privilege and honor. You two have set a very, very high bar. It was -- joy may not be the right

Page 24 word -- but it was exciting to watch you in action and it 1 2 was my great privilege to preside over the trial. 3 I probably got tired sometimes. I may have been 4 short with you, I may have lost my patience. So that I 5 apologize. 6 I have nothing but the utmost respect, and that 7 respect has increased today by your expressions of 8 appreciation for the Court, for the Court staff, especially 9 for Ms. Isen, without whom I couldn't get around every day. 10 So dare I say we miss you, we're glad to see you, 11 I think some have described this case -- this trial as epic, one might even say it was a marathon, but we're completing 12 13 the marathon today, 26.2 miles. 14 Before you go -- see she's telling me what to do 15 She's telling me I can't give it away. But because 16 each case stands on its own Ms. Isen and I have a parting 17 gift for each of you. This is it, this is the whole case 18 right here. They say -- it says long credit, short protection, black net seller, red net buyer, short credit, 19 20 long protection. Would you approach? 21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I could have used that. 22 (Laughter) 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Take it and frame it. 25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This may be the part that I

Page 25 1 forgot. 2 (Laughter) 3 THE COURT: You're not getting my handwritten copies of the calendar which I've had taped on the wall. 4 5 These I'm going to keep so that I can remember everyone with 6 the 42 days. 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. I forgot one. Step back, 8 one more moment. I forgot the most important one. Your 9 10 families. Your families. Children, wives, anyone else in 11 your life who put up with this entire thing and who 12 undoubtedly asked you day in and day out when it was going 13 to be over. Are you kidding me we have to cancel vacation? 14 You look terrible. I can't stand this anymore. To your families, just thank you very much to 15 16 I hope they're happy to have you back. I'm sure that 17 they are. So my husband on the other hand you're going to hear from him. 18 19 (Laughter) 20 THE COURT: Any way, I think that's it. I think we're done. All right? Thank you very much. 21 22 (A chorus of thank you) 23 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 24 10:02 a.m.) 25

Page 26 INDEX RULINGS PAGE Doc #56300 Motion for Approval of Settlement Agreement Among Citibank, N.A., and Certain of Its Affiliates, and Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., and Certain of Its Affiliates

Page 27 1 CERTIFICATION 2 I, Dawn South certify that the foregoing transcript is a 3 true and accurate record of the proceedings. 4 Digitally signed by Dawn South 5 Dawn South DN: cn=Dawn South, o, ou, email=digital@veritext.com, c=US Date: 2018.04.25 12:05:04 -04'00' 6 7 Dawn South 8 Certified Electronic Transcriber 9 10 11 Date: October 16, 2017 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 Veritext Legal Solutions 23 330 Old Country Road 24 Suite 300 25 Mineola, NY 11501